



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

against the hard usage meted out to our Californian Spanish place names, but Mr. Eldredge should, one thinks, have informed himself long ago that there are both right and wrong, necessary and unnecessary places for accents in Spanish, and that there is such a thing as agreement between adjectives and their nouns: the book is disfigured throughout with such errors as *Cárlos*, *Cármelo*, *Purísima Concepcion*, and *Nuestro Senora*. Perhaps, indeed, it would be as well to allow *Rio de los Plumas* and *Isla de los Yeguas* (*cf.* p. 559) to remain simply *Feather River* and *Mare Island*.

FREDERICK J. TEGGART.

*A History of the United States.* By EDWARD CHANNING. Volume III. *The American Revolution, 1761-1789.* (New York: The Macmillan Company. 1912. Pp. vii, 585.)

THE completion of the third volume of the great historical work which Professor Channing has undertaken is a notable event in the history-writing world. The last volume, as the preceding ones, compels admiration for the adventurer that with no middle flight has dared a task of such magnitude. If this volume alone were the product of a scholar's pliant hours won from the stress of an academic life, it would deserve high praise, but as one of eight volumes of a true *magnum opus*, it moves one to enthusiasm for its mastery of the period. The reviewer read it with unflagging interest, held by the clear, direct style, unadorned except by the simple ornament of truth. The author never allows the desire to be literary or interesting to become stronger than the desire to be accurate. The restraint is marked. There is no loud denunciation of rascality, unworthiness, or inefficiency, but the mere inexorable statement of facts. The historical technic is well-nigh faultless, and there is absolute honesty as to the nature of the sources of information. Always cautious, suspicious of the least inconsistency in the evidence, no task is too great when once the author's interest and desire to know is aroused. He does not hesitate to let the daylight into even the most able-bodied historical myths with his critical rapier. There is a marked generosity in the recognition of the work of young investigators, even when that work is still in manuscript. But the work is not based merely on monographs, for there is much first-hand investigation, well ruminated upon. After some twelve years' study of the period, the reviewer found the volume abounding in facts that he did not know, and sown with shrewd and canny interpretations which are new and yet convincing.

This much that is appreciation has been written with perfect frankness, and now we turn to criticism, even though we seem to deserve Sir Henry Wotton's dictum that critics are the brushers of noblemen's clothes. In the matter of emphasis, Professor Channing's interests seem curiously hemmed in by the American sky-line. The historical account rarely leaves the Atlantic coast, so that foreign matters of vast importance in determining the outcome of the struggle, receive only the cold

respect of a passing glance. The French Alliance, the Spanish-French Alliance, the Armed Neutrality, even the political conditions in England itself are disposed of in all too hasty a manner, even though with understanding and appreciation. It is enough, perhaps, for the historian who already knows the facts, but not for the general reader. And this brings us to say that, on the whole, this seems an historians' history, always to be admired and read with interest by the specialist, but unlikely to interest greatly the mere cultured reader, because in many parts too compact, accompanied with too little explanation. The Armed Neutrality, the formation of which was one of the most important events of the whole struggle in its effect upon the outcome of the Revolution, is disposed of in five lines (p. 323)—rivalling in laconic brevity Caesar's description of his victory over Pharnaces. The negotiations between France and Spain with a view to alliance, wherein are displayed motives and plans most significant in their bearing on the future history of the Mississippi Valley, are despatched in one line and two words (p. 301). They are also briefly commented upon in a later paragraph (p. 354). The interesting and important history of the West during the Revolutionary War receives the most meagre treatment, one that would mean little to a reader who did not already know the facts. What will the historians of the West say to a history of the Revolution which mentions Lord Dunmore's War only in a foot-note, and does not contain even the names of Andrew Lewis, Daniel Boone, Sevier, or Robertson? Professor Channing says in a foot-note that Captain Mahan has set the Valcour Island conflict on Lake Champlain in its rightful place in history, but if space and emphasis mean anything to this end, Professor Channing does not do it. There are several examples of this foot-note recognition, but textual indifference.

In the otherwise strong and scholarly treatment of the causes of the Revolution, there is shown an astonishing blindness to social forces, notably those of sectarian and ecclesiastical character. A dozen lines (p. 13) suggest the sectarian controversies as a sort of vanishing view, no more. In the second volume, there is a fairly adequate treatment of the controversy respecting the Anglican Episcopate, and of other annoyances to which the colonial dissenters were subjected by the Anglican influences on the British government, but these the author does not in any way relate to the Revolution, and they are ignored in this volume as causes of the struggle.

In this connection, we must declare a radical difference of opinion as to the fundamental causes of the Revolution. In general, we believe that political theories and constitutional arguments are manipulated to meet the economic necessities of those making the arguments, but when Professor Channing states the different political philosophy of the English and Americans (1) as to the relation of government to the individual, (2) as to the relation of the centre to the parts in an imperial organization, and (3) as to representation, leaving the impression that these differences are incidental to the economic differences—caused by the dispute over the monopoly of trade and taxation, we think that he is

placing the incidental cart before the causal horse. We believe that the Americans, from a variety of causes arising throughout the colonial period, had come to have a predominant political theory and way of thinking about the British constitution, very different from the predominant theory and thinking in England, and that when the aggravating economic differences arose, each doubted the sincerity of the other, because each argued with a different conception of the terms employed. An outraged logic rather than economic suffering drove the colonists into rebellion.

But in all these matters there is a chance for a difference of opinion, and we turn from these to point out some actual errors. Professor Channing seems wholly to misunderstand the reason why England made war upon the Netherlands (1780), saying: "The English became aware that a treaty was actually in agitation between America and Holland, and declared war", but the truth is that it was the fact of the Netherlands joining the Armed Neutrality to secure its defense of the neutral commerce which was the real reason, though the Dutch treaty was the pretended one. Again, speaking of the three-fifths compromise in the Constitutional Convention on the matter of representation and apportionment of direct taxation, he speaks of the "federal ratio" as an "artificial number", but as a matter of fact the three-fifths representation of slaves was reasoned—based upon the fact that it was generally agreed that a slave did about three-fifths as much work as a free white laborer. One other important error should be pointed out. The author accepts Professor Turner's theory that Vergennes had in mind, at some future time, to secure the retrocession of Louisiana from Spain and again to make France a power on the continent of North America, but we are convinced by material contained in a thesis now in manuscript, but soon we hope to be published, that Vergennes did not believe in the profitability of colonies, and that his real desire was to set up in America, perhaps one, possibly three republics just strong enough to keep England from extending her power in America, but weak enough to look to France for support, and in gratitude therefor to give France her trade, which in Vergennes's opinion was the only thing which made colonies, otherwise expensive, worth while. The reviewer hardly needs to say that he views with compassion Professor Channing's non-committal attitude on the subject of state sovereignty in the Revolution. Had he read a certain article on that subject—of which he seems unaware—in volume XII. of the *AMERICAN HISTORICAL REVIEW*, he could not have been in such Egyptian darkness. There are quite a number of other important monographs, the best on their particular subjects, which have escaped the writer's attention. We would that we had been permitted space to point out in detail many of the excellent qualities of the book, but in a limited review the critic must improve his opportunities, though at the expense of the pleasure of giving praise. In spite of the faults—if, indeed, they are faults, and the reviewer not mistaken—the work is a permanent monument to American scholarship, a virile, truthful, and inspiring history, worthy of the great theme.

C. H. VAN TYNE.